

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciatively notes that claims 6, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully requests this be held in abeyance pending allowance of the independent claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langner et al (US Patent No. 6,867,711, hereinafter "Langner") in view of Briffe et al (US Patent No. 6,057,786, hereinafter "Briffe") and Factor (US Patent No. 6,281,810, hereinafter "Factor"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

None of Langner, Briffe and Factor teaches the standby display equipment as claimed in claim 1. Claim 1 claims a standby display equipment allowing the display, independently of the main display system, of integrated standby data including a standby horizon. The standby display equipment is identical to the automatic pilot control equipment from the hardware point of view and the software point of view. The standby display equipment comprises a display screen capable of displaying the integrated standby data, and has at least two operating modes, one of the modes being an integrated standby data display mode and the other being a mode of displaying the automatic pilot set points given by the pilot. In normal operating conditions, the standby display equipment operating in a different mode from the automatic pilot control equipment.

As depicted in numerical embodiments of the present application, a standby display equipment is an equipment which produces and displays information, independently from the production and the display of the corresponding primary information that are displayed on a main display.

In order to facilitate understanding about the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully presents the following explanation about “standby display equipment”: small aircraft may not have standby display equipment, and large aircraft do have standby equipment; large aircraft may also have a pilot and a copilot, each having his own main display, but the standby equipment is an additional display for the main displays, i.e. the main display of the copilot is not the standby equipment of the pilot or vice-versa, because the main displays use the same source of information. Confusion should not be made between a double display for a pilot and a copilot, and an independent standby display for displaying information upon failure of the main display system or the main displays systems.

As described in Paragraph [0002] of the Specification of the present application, a standby equipment conventionally displays: horizon, attitude, altitude, speed, which is the information that the pilot will need in case of failure of the main system and display.

Langner shows one display or several displays, but not a standby equipment with the generally admitted meaning. Nowhere does Langner suggest as to how a standby equipment could relate to the automatic pilot control and display, which is the subject of the claimed invention.

Briffe indicates that standby equipment may be present, but does not mention anything about its relation to other components. Contrary to what the Examiner has stated to reject claim 1, Briffe teach a head-up display, but not a standby display equipment. The head-up display is a different equipment which does not contain standby instruments and does not display any standby information. Nowhere does Briffe suggest how the standby equipment could relate to the automatic piloting control and display, which is the subject of the claimed invention.

Factor does not disclose any relation between a standby instrument and the automatic piloting control, which are the subjects of the claimed invention. The screen shown in Factor is the main display; there is no separate standby equipment as claimed here, separate from the main display, and there is no standby equipment also having an automatic piloting control.

Based on the afore-mentioned reasons, even if Langner, Briffe and Factor can be combined, none of Langner, Briffe and Factor teaches the standby display equipment as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merit. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: February 25, 2008
KMB/SY/ser/cac